

September 15, 1976

Mr. Randy Jackson
Planning Office
Department of Land and Natural Resources
P. O. Box 621
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Dear Mr. Jackson:

State Recreation Resource System
Plans and Trails and Access System Plan

Time and available staff have not permitted as in-depth a review of these documents as we would have preferred. However, the following comments have been prepared for your consideration with the assistance of Allan Sommarstrom, Geography Department, and Margaret Stanzione and Jacquelin Miller of the Environmental Center. We hope that time will permit a more detailed review of the next stage document, particularly by our Maui-Molokai reviewers.

General Comments

The development and preparation of the plans presented is certainly a commendable task and one which surely will prove essential in the long range planning of recreational resources.

Perhaps the major question which comes to our mind in reviewing the plans, both for Maui and Molokai, is that of how the "high value recreation areas" were selected. Because the quality and utility of planning is so dependent on the information considered in the process, it would be most helpful if some brief reference could be included as to the types and sources of such information. What criteria were established to delineate "high value recreation areas"?

In reading through both the Maui and Molokai plans one cannot help but feel that the direction of emphasis is heavily weighed toward needs and desires of the resident population of each respective island. This is understandable and we would agree that the needs and concerns of the residents should have first priority. However, it is also true that State supported, owned and maintained facilities must take into consideration the needs and concerns of

all the citizens of the State of Hawaii. To this end we would suggest that consideration be given to some minor re-wording, for example with regard to access being limited to "local people," and comments such as "... the best opportunities to supply the recreation needs of Maui." The recreation needs of the state must also be considered.

Maui

III. General Needs and Findings

There appears to be an inconsistency between items A and E(1). Item A states the "physical facilities management is generally adequate in existing parks . . ."etc. The local citizens have listed as a first priority item the need to "improve management of existing recreation areas" This apparent inconsistency in view should be clarified.

IV. Recommendations for New Recreation Opportunities

The "evaluation process" cited in this paragraph should be briefly described.

In conclusion, we would like to commend the authors for including a section on "special problems to be resolved" which directs attention to problems which will likely persist and which involve action by other units of government, private interest groups, and residents.

We appreciate the opportunity to have commented on these plans and look forward to reviewing the final recommendations.

Yours very truly,

Doak C. Cox
Director

cc: Contributors